

JUL 16 2015 *DC*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

**THOMAS G. BRUTON
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT**

**ROBERT KOLINEK, individually
and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,**

PLAINTIFF

v.

**WALGREEN CO., an Illinois
Corporation**

DEFENDANT

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

No. 13-CV-04806

Hon. Matthew Kennelly

NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO THE SETTLEMENT

I, Paige Nash, declare:

I am a class member. I received a postcard notifying me of the settlement at my home at 4134 Hawthorne Ave., Dallas, Texas 75219-2231. My claim number is WTT-106462713401 and the phone number where I received the calls is 214-207-0742.

I wish the Court to consider the following:

(a) The class representative's claim does not present common issues of law or fact, and are not typical of the claims of the class. Therefore, this case should not proceed as a class action.

- (b) There are not common questions of law or fact.
- (c) The requirement of commonality does not exist.
- (d) Even if the proposed settlement is approved, the proposed attorney fees are unreasonable.
- (e) As of the date of the preparation of this objection no detailed fee petition listing the number of hours by the attorneys.
2. The settlement when taken as a whole is not fair reasonable or adequate and should not be approved.
 3. The parties have not proved that common issues predominate, and that the representatives' claims are not typical, and there is evidence that should be at least enough to require them to make a detailed showing that Rule 23 is met.
 4. It is the rule that one of the major if not the major factor in assessing a settlement is "the strength of Plaintiff's case". The reality is that Plaintiff's probably will not get the class certified much less prevail at trial. The question then becomes is this a settlement driven by attorneys fees.
 5. The fee agreement should be checked by using the lodestar cross-check method. Based on what the class is getting the fees are excessive.
 6. Given the revisions that the Federal Communications Commission made to the Protections Against Unwanted Calls and Texts on June 18, 2015, all Walgreens is agreeing to do in the future is follow the law.

7. I request the Court to reject the settlement.

Respectfully submitted,

Paige Nash.
4134 Hawthorne Ave.
Dallas, Texas 75219-2231

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Paige Nash hereby certify that on the ____ day of _____ 2015, a true and correct copy of the Objection to Proposed Settlement was served on all counsel of record by United States mail.

Clerk of the Court
Everett McKinley Dirksen United States Courthouse
219 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, IL 60604

Benjamin H. Richman
EDELSON PC
350 North State Street
Suite 1300
Chicago, Illinois 60654

Bradley J. Andreozzi
Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
191 North Wacker Drive
Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606



Paige Nash.